

Appln. No. Serial No. 10/304,895

Amdt. Dated 11/15/04

First Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 07/14/2004

Page 16 of 18

REMARKS

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, Claims 1-40 are pending in this application. The Examiner rejected Claims 1-10, 12, 14-23, 25, 27-31, 33, and 35-37 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), and rejected Claims 11, 24, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 1, 2-3, 11-16, 24, 26-27 and 32-34 have been amended, and new Claims 38-40 have been added in the foregoing amendment.

Claims 1-10, 12, 14-23, 25, 27-31, 33, and 35-38

Are Not Anticipated by *Skardon*

The Examiner rejected Claims 1-10, 12, 14-23, 25, 27-31, 33, and 35-37 as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,466,133 to Skardon ("*Skardon*"). This rejection is traversed for the reasons discussed below.

Claims 1, 14 and 27

A method of amended Claim 1 requires, among other elements, processing the environmental information in the base device according to a user information of an individual user when the environmental information exceeds a threshold, wherein the user information includes the threshold information.

In contrast, *Skardon* describes that user information is used to generate air/asthma advice for an individual patient. *Skardon* does not describe processing environmental information when the environmental information exceeds a user-specified threshold, as required by amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Claim 1 is not anticipated by *Skardon*, and should be allowed.

Amended Claims 14 and 27 include similar limitations to Claim 1. Thus, Claims 14 and 27 are also not anticipated by *Skardon*. Accordingly, amended Claims 14 and 27 should also be allowed.

Claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-38

Claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-38 depend directly or indirectly from amended Claims 1, 14 and 27. The remarks made above in support of the patentability of the independent

Appln. No. Serial No. 10/304,895
Amdt. Dated 11/15/04
First Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 07/14/2004
Page 17 of 18

Claims 1, 14 and 27 are equally applicable to distinguish the dependent claims from *Skardon*. Accordingly, Claims 2-13, 15-26, and 28-38 should also be allowed.

Claims 39 and 40


Newly added Claim 39 requires commanding a measurement condition setting update of all sensors in a region for carrying out the measurement from the base device, when at least one sensor operated to carry out the measurement in a selected region measures a large amount of pollens. As described at page 14, lines 10 to 18, when the pollen sensors are arranged in a mountainous region, normally one out of several sensors is operated to carry out the measurement in view of the limited battery power. However, when some sensors measures a large amount of pollens, all the sensors in that region are commanded to carry out the measurement. *Skardon* does not show or suggest commanding a measurement condition setting update of all sensors in a region for carrying out the measurement from the base device, when at least one sensor operated to carry out the measurement in a selected region measures a large amount of pollens. Accordingly, Claim 39 should be allowed.

Claim 40 has similar limitations to Claim 39. Thus, Claim 40 should also be allowed.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a complete response to the Office Action identified above. This application should now be in condition for allowance, and the Applicants solicit a notice to that effect. If there are any issues that can be addressed via telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the undersigned at 404.685.6799.

Respectfully submitted,



By: Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

Appln. No. Serial No. **10/304,895**
Amdt. Dated 11/15/04
First Response in Appln, Reply to Office Action of 07/14/2004
Page 18 of 18

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530
Telephone: (404) 815-6500
Facsimile: (404) 815-6555
Our Docket: 44471-255858